

Morrow 120115

**DECISION**



**THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES**  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20548

**FILE:** B-207270

**DATE:** December 13, 1982

**MATTER OF:** Professional Carpet Service

**DIGEST:**

Protest against form of contract pricing schedules is dismissed since protest relates to administration of contract for resolution by the contracting agency, not GAO.

On April 14, 1982, the General Services Administration (GSA) issued invitation for bids (IFB) No. GSD-WDPR-20004-A for rug and carpet services. The IFB required bidders to bid individual prices for separate service areas by bidding the identical price from a predetermined GSA price schedule or a single plus or minus percentage factor to be applied to the price in the predetermined schedule. Separate awards were to be made by group for each service area to the responsible bidder whose offer produced the lowest price under that pricing method (applicable to all items in each group), less any eligible prompt-payment discount.

Prior to bid opening, Professional Carpet Service (PCS) filed a protest seeking a ruling which would require GSA to compute the net price bid by the awardees and list that price on the contract schedules disseminated to the using agencies or withdraw the bidding format from the solicitation.

For the reasons that follow, we dismiss the protest.

The contracting officer indicates that price schedules are issued to the using agencies as a preliminary step in administration of the contracts after award has been made. The schedule reflects the percentages (plus or minus) to be applied to the predetermined GSA price schedule of the successful bidders, less any discounts.

PCS complains that this method of printing the schedule leads to overpayments by the using agencies because, in the past, these agencies have paid contractors the net price listed on the schedule rather than the contractor's offered percentage discounts. Moreover, PCS maintains that GSA's

method of applying the contractor's prompt-payment discount terms to the prices printed on the schedule encourages contractors to overbill the agencies for the services provided. As support for these allegations, PCS has submitted several documents which allegedly show instances where the price schedules have led to billing problems for the agencies.

Our Office has considered the propriety of the single percentage factor method of awarding contracts and found it unobjectionable. See, e.g., Michael O'Connor, Inc., 57 Comp. Gen. 107 (1976), and Elrich Construction Company, B-187726, February 14, 1977, 77-1 CPD 105. The complaint that PCS has about the method GSA uses to print the price schedules relates to performance of the contract, not to any impropriety in the award of the contract. Therefore, this question is one involving the administration of the contract, not the award, and is for resolution by the contracting agency, not GAO. Northwest Forest Workers Association, B-202131, August 25, 1981, 81-2 CPD 175. Therefore, the protest is dismissed.

Nevertheless, we note that GSA informs us that agency officials will consider PCS's request that GSA publish net prices for carpet cleaning services and will make any changes in the procedures deemed appropriate.

*Harry R. Van Cleve*  
Harry R. Van Cleve  
Acting General Counsel